

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SORAYA MARIA RIGOR,

Plaintiff,

v.

SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT,
et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:25-cv-00243-TLN-SCR

ORDER

Plaintiff Soraya Maria Rigor (“Plaintiff”) is proceeding pro se in this matter, which was referred to the magistrate judge pursuant to Local Rule 302(c)(21) and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

On August 27, 2025, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which were served on Plaintiff and which contained notice to Plaintiff that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. (ECF No. 6.) Plaintiff has not filed objections to the findings and recommendations, but did file a First Amended Complaint (“FAC”) (ECF No. 7) during the 14-day period for objections. The Court will construe the FAC as an objection.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, this court has conducted a *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. The findings and recommendations stated that Plaintiff’s claims were barred by *Heck v.*


1 *Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477 (1994) and the applicable statute of limitations, and that further leave to
2 amend would be futile. (ECF No. 6 at 5-6.) Consideration of the FAC, which again alleges that a
3 2008 conviction was wrongful, does not undermine the findings and recommendations.

4 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 5 1. The findings and recommendations filed August 27, 2025, are adopted in full;
- 6 2. The complaint is dismissed for failure to state a claim pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)
7 and without further leave to amend; and
- 8 3. The Clerk is directed to enter Judgment and close this file.

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 Date: September 29, 2025

11
12
13 
14 TROY L. NUNLEY
15 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28